



# IOWAccess Advisory Council

## IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request Design approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request Implementation approval.

### Part I - Project Information

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Date:</b>   | 02/25/08   |
| <b>Agency Name:</b>  | Department of Natural Resources  |
| <b>Project Name:</b>   | Animal Feeding Operations  |
| <b>Agency Manager:</b>   | Christine Spackman   |
| <b>Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:</b>                                 | 515-281-7276<br>christine.spackman@dnr.iowa.gov  |
| <b>Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):</b>                      | Wayne Gieselman  |
| <b>Initial Total for Design:</b>   | \$50,000 (funded by DNR)   |
| <b>Initial Total for Implementation:</b>                                     | \$282,000 (plus \$86,000 funded by DNR)  |
| <b>Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:</b>             | \$418,000  |
| <b>Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)</b> | Design Start Date: November 4, 2007<br>Design End Date: February 15, 2008<br>Implementation Start Date: April 1, 2008<br>Implementation End Date: March 15, 2009 |
| <b>Revised Total for Design and Implementation:</b>                          | \$   |
| <b>Revised Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:</b>             | \$   |

## Part II - Project Overview

**A. Project Summary:** Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

**Response:** A new Animal Feeding Operation application using current technology standards and including integration with the department's GIS system will allow staff, citizens and interested parties timely access to information about confinements (totally roofed operations) and open lots.

Citizens will be able to answer questions via the Internet such as:

- Are there AFO facilities in my area?
- What kind of animals and how many are in the facility?
- Is the facility planning on constructing new buildings and adding capacity?
- Does the facility have an approved manure management plan?
- Which watersheds or streams could be impacted by the AFO facility?

The functional requirements for the AFO application are a result of design sessions with DNR staff AND interested parties such as the Sierra Club, Iowa Environmental Council, Iowa Association of County Conservation Boards, Des Moines Water Works, and Farm Bureau.

The AFO application will track reviews of more than 300 permit applications per year to ensure that new and expanding large confinements and open feedlots are designed and built to meet state requirements and protect environmentally sensitive areas that include certain lakes, streams, wetlands, and vulnerable aquifers. The application will track reviews of more than 5000 manure and nutrient management plans and display compliance activity associated with AFOs. The system's data will be available through easy to use search criteria, reports and be designed to allow flexible changes to automated letters. Public access will allow producers to view their records and track permit application status and will allow public interest groups access to the data.

The regulation of animal feeding operations is a controversial issue in Iowa and throughout the US. Agriculture is a \$12.3 billion business in Iowa, with animal agriculture providing \$6.2 billion annually in gross sales. However, animal agriculture activities create both real and perceived threats to surface waters, groundwater and air quality. The debate over how best to balance Iowan's need for clean air and clean water with the need to have a strong agricultural economy is complex and often emotional. Without a carefully designed system for managing animal feeding operation data it is nearly impossible to determine the effectiveness of the current regulations or make informed objective decisions about proposed policies.

The proposed system is a critical step in the development of sustainable solutions to Iowa's air and water quality problems. Making these data easily accessible will reduce bureaucratic headaches and increase the public's ability to take an active and informed role in the management of their environment. **In short, this proposed system will bring us closer to a mutually agreeable solution by empowering people on all sides of the debate.** Specific attention has been paid to planning a database that can accommodate anticipated regulatory changes. Past rule changes have cost the department and the taxpayers considerably because even small changes required a dedicated programmer to navigate the complex and rigid architecture of the existing system.

**How will the project be accomplished?** DNR intends to issue an RFP to secure a contractor to develop the AFO application.

**Anticipated Costs:** DNR has estimated that the development of application including the integration with the Field Office Compliance Application and implementation of the GIS component will cost \$368,000 with the DNR committing 27% of the resources.

### Benefits:

Reduce the time for construction reviews and approvals allowing facilities to build and optimize revenue.

Reduce DNR staff time answering questions by phone (currently 10,000 calls per year)

Reduce drive time for citizens to access details about an AFO facility.

Allow cities and counties to better manage their resources, such as planning for road maintenance on heavily traveled roads leading to AFO facilities.

Reduce requests for data extractions.

## **B. Strategic Plan:** How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

**Response:** The DNR's work with livestock producers meets a goal of the Governor's Leadership Agenda – to reduce the number of impaired waters and ultimately reduce Iowa's contribution of nutrients to the overly enriched waters in the Gulf of Mexico (hypoxia). Livestock operations contribute to impairments such as bacteria, nutrients and toxic algae.

The DNR has stream monitoring data showing extremely high levels of ammonia, fecal coliform bacteria and other pollutants originating from livestock operations. Eliminating discharges of manure from open feedlots and reducing mismanaged manure application can greatly decrease the quantity of pollutants reaching streams. Providing facility locations, animal numbers data, and manure storage and application activities allow watershed planners within and outside of the DNR to better prioritize their efforts to improve water quality.

Construction Permits issued for animal agriculture is one of six measurable activities tracked by the DNR on the Results Iowa website. <http://www.resultsiowa.org/naturalres.html>

This year the DNR's director identified 10 top priorities for the Agency. One of those priorities is to set an example by minimizing the environmental impact of the department. This project will reduce the need to make multiple copies of documents while reducing cost, energy, and emissions associated with transportation of those materials.

## **C. Current Technology:** Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction? Are programming elements consistent with a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) approach? Are programming elements consistent with existing enterprise standards?

**Response:** The current database uses a mixture of outdated technologies including Visual Basic 6, ASP 3.0, Crystal Reports 9.2.2 and SQL 2000. The proposed project will be developed with current DNR standards including C# and MS SQL 2005. Utilizing these technologies will allow better performance of the database and allow the public to view and search the data. DNR has also established the State of Iowa Enterprise Authentication and Authorization (A&A) service as a standard. The new system will allow AFO data to be mapped using Geographical Information System (GIS) technology which has become the primary evaluation and planning tool for understanding and managing natural resources.

## **D. Statutory or Other Requirements**

### **Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?**

YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

**Response:** AFOs are regulated by federal regulations for wastewater discharges (40 CFR 122) and concentrated animal feeding operations (40 CFR 412). Iowa manages those delegated regulatory programs and needs an effective database to track and report on our regulatory actions.

### **Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?**

YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

**Response:** Iowa regulates AFOs to protect surface and groundwater resources (567 IAC Chapter 65). All AFOs must follow some regulations when land applying manure or when building a new structure or expanding an existing

operation. DNR needs an effective database to track and report on our regulatory actions. This program receives considerable legislative attention and external oversight by stakeholders.

**Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?**

YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Response:** No, although some of this data will be used by Emergency Response and/or Homeland Security if human or animal health is threatened by water or airborne disease.

**Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?**

YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

**Response:**

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

**Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.



## E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens

**1. Project Participants** - List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

**Response:** Direct Users:

75 DNR staff will enter data into the system and use it to approve facility construction permits and manage manure plans. Field inspectors, geologists that assess environmental vulnerability of sites and prospective sites, planners working on improving water quality of impaired streams, geographic information system specialists, communications staff responding to press inquiries and program managers.

Other Interested Parties:

8,000 AFO facility owners and their consultants will use the database to monitor permit project status, manure management plan requirements, and compliance activity of their operations.

10,000 Citizens who may check the location of AFOs and see associated permits and violations

500 City and county staff will review AFO location information to determine impact on the maintenance of local roads

Interest Groups including: Iowa Sierra Club, Iowa Environmental Council, Farm Bureau, Pork Producers, Iowa Association of Counties, Iowa Association of County Conservation Boards, Des Moines Water Works, EPA, US Natural Resource Conservation Service, Iowa Soybean Association

Legislators, university researchers and the press will also use the database.

**2. Service Improvements** - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

**Response:** The information in the database will be available to citizens. New AFOs draw considerable interest from area citizens and project information and status will be available to them. Electronic attachment of permits, permit applications, manure management plans, and DNR correspondence is planned. Currently the status of an application can only be confirmed through direct contact or correspondence with DNR staff. For the public, documents can only be obtained by physically travelling to the location where the records are housed which may be one of seven offices. The environmental impacts of this program will be reduced by eliminating the need for duplicating and transporting records to various offices around the state. The time lost while waiting for mailed records and filing those records will also be reduced.

Stakeholders and environmental groups will be able to analyze historical data for trends. Locations of AFOs will be searchable by watershed for the first time enabling analysis of impacts to surface and groundwater.

**3. Citizen Impact** – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

**Response:** The information in the database will be available to citizens, public interest groups, city and county staff, and the press. DNR Field Office staff receive 10,000 AFO related phone calls each year. The DNR records center receives over 25 requests for data extraction from the AFO database annually. The DNR averages almost 1 media contact per hour during most weeks. Roughly half of the press coverage that pertains to state agencies in total involves the DNR, and a portion of these press requests relate to the environmental impact of animal feeding operations. There is significant interest in access to AFO application and its detailed data.

New AFOs draw considerable interest from nearby residents and concerned citizens and project information and status will be available to them. The relationship with the regulated public will also be improved by allowing these individuals and businesses access to their records and reducing frustration caused by waiting for responses to questions about permit status and other requirements. A more transparent review process will allow citizens to evaluate the effectiveness of current policies and procedure and improve accountability. This transparency will benefit both the regulated public and those interested in protection of Iowa's natural resources.

Stakeholders and environmental groups will be able to analyze historical data for trends. Location of AFOs on a watershed basis will be available for the first time allowing analysis of impact to impaired streams. Integration with compliance activity data, manure spill responses, fish kill data, stream impairments and watershed assessments will be greatly enhanced by the new database design. The existing database format does not allow for queries across these multiple databases and limits the ability to relate the AFO program to other programs.

Maps of AFOs will be used by numerous stakeholders for everything from real estate planning to natural resource management. For instance, recently our staff were asked to provide maps to help investors evaluate locations for manure digester facilities which have the potential to reduce impacts of animal agriculture on air and water quality while simultaneously producing energy. Counties are using these maps to prioritize their road-grading efforts in anticipation of a wet spring and significant truck traffic. Individuals planning to build homes in rural areas are especially interested in knowing the locations of existing and proposed animal feeding operations. We are currently not able to map facilities which have been approved, but not constructed, or sites that are proposed but not yet approved.

**4. Public Health and/or Safety** – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

**Response:** Improving compatibility with other databases, such as the Emergency Response database and Homeland Security will allow AFO data to be used for evaluating risks to human health and safety if necessary in the case of diseases transported by animal waste.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

**Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).
- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).
- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).



[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

**Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).



## F. Scope

**Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?**

YES (If "YES", explain.) NO, it is a stand-alone project

**Response:**

**Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?**

YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Response:** While the AFO project is not part of the Field Office Compliance project it is related because citizens who are reviewing compliance and enforcement information will want to see the associated detail about the facility's permits or information on the animal types and counts.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

**Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**



- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project / expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)
- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points).
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)

The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of implementation and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

## G. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology/IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

### Response:

**FY2008 DNR Investment \$50,000 (70%) IOWAccess Investment \$35,000**

**FY2009 DNR Investment \$68,000 (27%) IOWAccess Investment \$247,000**

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

### **Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)**

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)



## Part III – Design Proposal

**Amount of Design Funding Requested: \$ NONE. DNR has elected to complete this section to provide additional detail to IOWAccess Council members about the project. DNR completed the design using our own funds.**

### A. Process Reengineering

Provide a *pre-project or pre-expenditure* (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

**Response:** Over the last several years the DNR has conducted several Kaizen events to re-engineer the processes associated with permitting and monitoring AFOs. As a result we have implemented new business processes to reduce the time it takes to review construction requests and manure management plans. In the design of this new application we have reduced the number of database tables by 40%. We have been able to achieve this reduction because of staff agreement on the data elements that need to be collected.

Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

**Response:** Staff and citizens will link to a website where they can directly access and download data or view associated documents for AFO facilities. Citizens will not need to drive to a DNR field office to view facility files as construction information will be scanned and attached to the facility data.

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

#### **Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).




---

### B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Design phase of the project. Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database design. Also include the parties responsible for each item. COMPLETED BY DNR 2/15/2008

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

#### **Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).



- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).

### C. Spending plan

**Explain how the funds will be allocated.**

Funds will be allocated based on milestone payments identified by the successful vendor and negotiated by the DNR.

### D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

**Respond to the following and transfer data to the Design Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:**

**1. One Year Pre-Project Cost** - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

**Describe One Year Pre-Project Cost:** THE DNR DOES NOT INTEND TO SHOW A COST SAVINGS ASSOCIATED WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFO APPLICATION. While we anticipate some reduction in staff time spent on phone inquiries and copying costs we expect that staff will apply that time to increase the compliance activities.

**Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| 10,000 phone inquiries @ 4 minutes each | 666 staff hours |
| 80 files reproduced                     | 20,000 pages    |
| 26 data requests                        | 78 hours        |

|   | State Total |
|---|-------------|
| <b>FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):</b>  | \$          |
| <b>Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):</b>                                    | \$          |
| <b>Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs &amp; support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):</b> | \$          |
| <b>Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:</b>   | <b>\$</b>   |

**2. One Year Post-Project Cost** - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.

**Describe One Year Post-Project Cost:**

**Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:**

|   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
|   | <b>State Total</b> |
| <b>FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):</b>  | \$                 |
| <b>Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):</b>                                    | \$                 |
| <b>Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs &amp; support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):</b> | \$                 |
| <b>Total One Year Post-Project Cost:</b>  | <b>\$</b>          |

**3. One Year Citizen Benefit** - Quantify the estimated one year value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

**Describe savings justification:**

| <u>Transaction Savings</u>   |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <b>Number of annual online transactions: 700 construction reviews; 432 office visits</b>   | <b>1,132</b>     |
| <b>Hours saved/transaction:</b>  | <b>1</b>         |
| <b>Number of Citizens affected:18,500</b>  |                  |
| <b>Value of Citizen Hour for Facility Owners and Engineers</b>                             | <b>\$100</b>     |
| <b>Total Transaction Savings:</b>  | <b>\$113,200</b> |
| <b>Other Savings (Describe) Travel expense to field offices @ 40 miles each (36 cents)</b> | <b>\$16,300</b>  |
| <b>Total One Year Citizen Benefit :</b>  | <b>\$129,500</b> |

4.

**Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance** - Quantify the estimated one year non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc

**Response:**

**5. Design Financial Benefit Worksheet**

|  |           |           |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):</b>                  | \$NA      |           |
| <b>B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):</b>                 | \$NA      |           |
| <b>C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):</b>                                  |           | \$ NA     |
| <b>D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):</b>                         |           | \$129,500 |
| <b>E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):</b> |           | \$NA      |
| <b>F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)</b>                                       | \$129,500 |           |
| <b>G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):</b>            | \$        |           |
| <b>Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =</b>   |           |           |
| <b>Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100</b>   |           |           |

**6. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable** - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

**Response:**

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



## Part IV – Implementation Funding

**Amount of Implementation Funding Requested: \$ 282,000**

**Amount of Hosting Requested: \$ None, DNR will pay ITE the monthly hosting fee as we do for over 30 other applications.**

*Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges*

### A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Implementation phase of the project. Include such items as **start date**, coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

**Response:**

DNR completed the application design as of February 15, 2008

The implementation phase will begin on April 1, 2008

RFP for contracted services released April 15, 2008

DNR begins to create the Test Plan and Test Cases April 16, 2008

Vendor selected May 23, 2008

Environmental Protection Commission Approval June 10, 2008

Development Begins June 11, 2008

Database Development; Application Development; Testing; Training; Documentation June 2008 through March 2009.

Project Completed March 15, 2009

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**  
**Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



### B. Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades.

|  |                   |                      |                      |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|  | <b>Current FY</b> | <b>Current FY +1</b> | <b>Current FY +2</b> |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

|   | Cost(\$)        | % Total Cost | Cost(\$)         | % Total Cost | Cost(\$)         | % Total Cost |
|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
| State General Fund                          | \$50,000        | 0%           | \$68,000         | 0%           | \$29,000 (maint) | 0%           |
| Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund           | \$35,000        | 0%           | \$247,000        | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           |
| Federal Funds                               | \$0             | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           |
| Local Gov. Funds                            | \$0             | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           |
| Grant or Private Funds                      | \$0             | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           |
| Other Funds (Specify)                       | \$0             | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           | \$0              | 0%           |
| <b>Total Project Cost</b>                   | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>0%</b>    | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>0%</b>    | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>0%</b>    |
| <b>Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total</b> | <b>\$85,000</b> | <b>0%</b>    | <b>\$315,000</b> | <b>0%</b>    | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>0%</b>    |

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**  
**Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



**C. Project Budget Table**

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project-related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[ \left( \frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

| Budget Line Items      | Budget Amount (1 <sup>st</sup> Year Cost) | Useful Life (Years) | % State Share | Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 <sup>st</sup> Year) | % State Share | Annual Prorated Cost |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|---------------|--|---------------|----------------------|
| Agency Staff           | \$228,000                                 | 10                  | %             | \$   | %             | \$                   |
| Software               | \$  |                     | %             | \$   | %             | \$                   |
| Hardware               | \$  |                     | %             | \$   | %             | \$                   |
| Training               | \$  |                     | %             | \$   | %             | \$                   |
| Facilities             | \$  |                     | %             | \$   | %             | \$                   |
| Professional Services  | 281,488                                   | 10                  | %             | \$29,000   | 100%          | \$                   |
| ITE Services           | \$4,800                                   | 10                  | %             | \$   | %             | \$                   |
| Supplies, Maint., etc. | \$  |                     | %             | \$   | %             | \$                   |
| Other                  | \$  |                     | %             | \$   | %             | \$                   |
| <b>Totals</b>          | <b>\$494,288</b>                          | <b>10</b>           | <b>%</b>      | <b>\$29,000</b>                                  | <b>100 %</b>  | <b>\$</b>            |

**D. Spending plan**

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

20% project management; 20% reports; 5% training and documentation, 15% for testing, 40% development

**E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits**

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:

**1. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance** – Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

**Response:**

**2. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable** – List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

**Response:**

**3. Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet**

|   |    |    |
|---|----|----|
| A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):                  | \$ |    |
| B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):                 | \$ |    |
| C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):                                  |    | \$ |
| D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):                         |    | \$ |
| E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4): |    | \$ |
| F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)                                       | \$ |    |
| G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):            | \$ |    |
| Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =   |    |    |
| Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100   |    |    |

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



# Evaluation Summary

*[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]*

---

## Design Phase:

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)                     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)           | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)           | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b><u>TOTAL DESIGN EVALUATION</u></b> (90 Points Maximum) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Implementation Phase:

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)           | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b><u>TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION</u></b> (35 Points Maximum) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

### 1. Improved customer service

**Response:**

- Benchmark baseline of permit review time
- Document feedback from citizens during focus groups at the completion of training and at 6 months

### 2. Citizen impact

**Response:**

- Track visits to website
- Identify reduction in call volume to Field Office staff
- Identify reduction in requests for data extractions

### 3. Cost Savings

**Response:** Not calculated

### 4. Project reengineering

**Response:** Reduce database elements by 40%

### 5. Source of funds (Budget %)

**Response:** Not calculated

### 6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

**Response:** Not calculated